

Re: Earth expansion – parameters for discussion

Source: <http://sci.tech–archive.net/Archive/sci.geo.geology/2005–01/0066.html>

From: George (george_at_wtfiswrongwithyou.com)

Date: 12/31/04

Date: Fri, 31 Dec 2004 14:13:47 GMT

"David Ford" <Nospam@internode.on.net> wrote in message
news:41d51536@duster.adelaide.on.net...

> *George wrote:*

>

>> "J. Taylor" <jota@gorge.NOSPAM.net> wrote in message

>> news:vio9t0h12h09deofjr56qguujle3q8sea2@4ax.com...

>>

>>> On Tue, 28 Dec 2004 16:53:48 GMT, "George"

>>><george@wtfiswrongwithyou.com> wrote:

>>>

>>>

>>>> "David Ford" <Nospam@internode.on.net> wrote in message

>>>> news:41d18181\$1@duster.adelaide.on.net...

>>>>

>>>>> *George wrote:*

>>>>>

>>>>>> "Bigdakine" <bigdakine@aol.comGetaGrip> wrote in message

>>>>>> news:20041227221416.12272.00002782@mb–m28.aol.com...

>>>>>>

>>>>>>

>>>>>>> *Subject: Re: Earth expansion – parameters for discussion*

>>>>>>> *From: David Ford Nospam@internode.on.net*

>>>>>>> *Date: 12/27/04 4:39 PM Hawaiian Standard Time*

>>>>>>> *Message–id: <41d0c771@duster.adelaide.on.net>*

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> *don findlay wrote:*

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>> *EARTH EXPANSION – Axioms on which to lay down Parameters for*

>>>>>>>>> *discussion:*

>>>>>>>>> _____

>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>> *1. Did the Earth once form a granitic ('continental') crust as a*

>>>>>>>>>> *result of differentiation (core mantle and crust) – Yes.*

>>>>>>>>>> *2. Did it cover the entire Earth? – Yes (Or:– how might it be*

>>>>>>>>conceived that differentiation could occur and 'whole–Earth Crust' not
>>>>>>>>form?)

>>>>>>>>3. Was that Whole–Earth Crust what is Today called "Pangaea"? –

>>>>>>>>Yes, because the movement picture that breaks up the
>>>>>>>>continental crust in the Atlantic _ Indian – Southern Oceans and
>>>>>>>>exposes the mantle as the ocean floors, also applies to the Pacific and
>>>>>>>>exposes the mantle there too. Same continental crust, same break up,
>>>>>>>>same movement picture – just bigger than already accepted by plate
>>>>>>>>tectonics.

>>>>>>>>4. Are 'obducted ophiolites' 'evidence' of an earlier ocean floor?

>>>>>>>>No, ..because these emplacements of mantle on continental crust are
>>>>>>>>easily accounted for within the same movement picture as in 3. ...and
>>>>>>>>are anyway of orders of magnitude insignificance to be related in any
>>>>>>>>way to the process known as 'plate tectonics'

>>>>>>>>Anyone got anything else to add?

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>5. Are there currently observed and identified far greater lengths of
>>>>>>>>rifting new–crust generation zones, than merely presumed crustal removal
>>>>>>>>zones?

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>YES.

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>The collective length of all trench zones is ~30,000 km, about a quarter
>>>>>>>>of the length of all spreading ridges (2 x ~60,000 km). The proposed
>>>>>>>>Plate tectonic 'balance' of construction and destruction of oceanic
>>>>>>>>crust is thus geometrically impossible on a sphere with these observed
>>>>>>>>features. In order for a crustal construction–destruction balance to be
>>>>>>>>in effect, ocean basins require co–equal lengths of assumed consumptive
>>>>>>>>trench .

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>Ford doesn't realize the convergence at subduction zones tends to be
>>>>>>>>faster

>>>>>>>>than the divergence at rifts.

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>and it just isn't there, even if those trench area really did

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>represent zones of crustal resumption back into the mantle.

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>.but why let basic physical facts interfere with a 'good' consensual
>>>>>>>>fiction huh? ;)

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>Ford still hasn't learned what Gauss's theorem is.

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>Incredible.

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>Stuart

>>>>>>Dr. Stuart A. Weinstein
>>>>>>Ewa Beach Institute of Tectonics
>>>>>>"To err is human, but to really foul things up requires a creationist"
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>"Creationists aren't impervious to Logic: They're oblivious to it."
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>What I find even more amazing is his assumption that the earth's crust is
>>>>>>in
>>>>>>some kind of balance or equilibrium, or that it even requires equilibrium
>>>>>>or
>>>>>>balanced conditions in order for subduction to occur. The fact of the
>>>>>>matter
>>>>>>is that the crust is not in equilibrium. That the crust is not in
>>>>>>equilibrium conditions was amply demonstrated the other day with the 9.0
>>>>>>earthquake that apparently has killed somewhere in the neighborhood of
>>>>>>40,000
>>>>>>people. But why let the physical facts interfere with a bad
>>>>>>non-consensual
>>>>>>fiction?
>>>>>>
>>>>>>You are such a goat George, for Earth's radius to be unchanging over a 200
>>>>>>mya
>>>>>>period, the generation of crust from the mantle has to equal the resumption
>>>>>>of
>>>>>>crust back into the mantle; this is a standard PT concept even a child can
>>>>>>grasp.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Really? And why is that? It can't just pile up crust and create mountains
>>>>>>like
>>>>>>in the himalayas, which get eroded down, creating sediments in the rivers,
>>>>>>lake
>>>>>>and oceans, downwarping the crust, and so forth and so on?
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Gravity will be very unhappy if you create holes in the interior of
>>>>>>the planet. If you remove mass from the interior and place it on the
>>>>>>exterior you have an energy imbalance. Something defied the edicts of
>>>>>>gravity, not only was energy expended, but mass was removed.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>It creates an imbalance.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Who said anything about creating holes in the interior? Oh right. You did.
>>>>>>Oh, and the earth is not in balance. It is always in a state of flux, of
>>>>>>change, of entropy.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>If it was in
>>>>>>equilibrium, there would be no topographic relief. Since there is plenty of
>>>>>>topographic relief to be found, your equilibrium theory hasn't a leg to

>>>>stand
>>>>on. The fact is that the earth is ever changing and dynamic. It is no more
>>>>in
>>>>equilibrium than the universe is.
>>>
>>>Unless you are into perpetual motion, it will have to balance for the
>>>system to continue to cycle.
>>
>>
>> Perpetual motion assumes that the universe (or the earth) will last forever.
>> As a scientist, I don't have the luxury of entertaining such fantasies.
>>
>>
>>>>>It is a balance, or to use your word, and equilibrium of the generation and
>>>>>the resumption of crustal rock in PT.
>>>>>
>>>>>Do you have a mental handicap I should know about?
>>>>
>>>>Do you have a valid point you'd like to make?
>>>
>>>Yep, balance the equation.
>>>
>>>JT
>>
>>
>> The earth is not a balanced system. It resides in an ellipse, not a perfect
>> circle, the rotation wobbles, and the earth's crust is highly fractured, and
>> moves around, among a zillion other unbalanced aspects of its nature. There
>> is nothing balanced about it, or the universe for that matter. Chaos rules.
>> Sorry to disappoint you.
>
>
> It is more than a slight dynamic imbalance as you suggest, about three
> quarters of the length of 'subduction zone' required is NON-EXISTENT!

I don't know where you got that measurement (that you've stated about a zillion times, and have never provided actual physical data to support that claim), but you didn't get it from the planet earth (oh right. You pulled it out of your ass). And even if it were true, so what? There are three basic tenets of plate tectonics (four, actually). The first is that the mid-oceanic ridges are spreading centers, places where new crust is being formed. Then there are subduction zones, places where crust is being recycled back into the mantle. Then there are collision zones, continent-continent, and continent-oceanic (other than subduction, otherwise known as subduction zones). And all of this is being driving by mantle convection.

So, if there aren't enough subduction zones to balance the out spreading centers, what could that possibly mean? It means that crust is piling up somewhere, since it isn't going back down into the mantle. And where could such places be where crust is piling up? FUCKING MOUNTAIN CHAINS, you moron. Orogenic belts. Even Carey understood the importance of orogenesis with regard

to the geologic history of the earth. 'Oh, but then you'd leave big voids in the earth because not all the material is being recycled'. Duh! Why then, do you think basins and huge areas of crustal subsidence exist? Because some 17th dimension celtic god kicked the earth's ass and make huge dents? The basins are there because of subsidence. The crust compensates for not having enough places for the crust to cycle back into the mantle by subsiding. Hence we have the ancient Appalachian, Illinois Basin, Michigan, and a zillion other basins. And if you look at the very bottom of those basins what do you find? Most of the time you find oceanic crust. The fact that 70 percent of the earth's surface is below sea level is not an accident. And you don't need an ocean for a spreading center to form. In fact, in most cases, they started within the continental boundaries (i.e., the African rift valleys). The spreading centers pull the continents apart and create ocean basins. But as those basins subside, new crust is formed both within the spreading centers and along the subduction zones as volcanic arcs. I could go on, but you don't believe one word of this so I'm wasting my time, which I suspect was your aim anyway.

> *That's not just a little dynamic–imbalance goofy, it's what's called totally*
> *IMPOSSIBLE ... IF subduction were in fact a real process at all, as plate*
> *tectonics merely presumes.*

Not impossible. Its happening as we speak. If you had lived in Sumatra last week, you likley would have died finding this out.

> *BTW, you act like geology of recent years has only found more (assumed)*
> *'subduction zone' in Cascadia, but you do also realise Antarctica is actively*
> *rifting ... and on top of this is also 100% surrounded by extending new crust*
> *formation along the southern ocean's MORs, and by a N–S continental rift in*
> *Africa, and massive extensional MOR complexes in the Atlantic and Indian*
> *Oceans, and the massively fast spreading occurring in the east Pacific MOR.*

The eastern half of which is subducting beneath the western coast of South America, creating one of the longest mountain ranges on dry land.

>
> *The length of MOR and continental rifting in the Southern hemisphere is around*
> *SEVEN times the length of the supposed 'subduction zones'.*

Based on what? Did you pull out you handy dandy measuring tape and measure them all? I hope you used a wet suit for the oceanic parts.

> *That is not a dynamic imbalance, it's just plain IMPOSSIBLE, and incompatible*
> *with the meagre amount of subduction zone.*

You haven't proven anything here. You've made a claim based on your word alone. You've presented no evidence that this is the case. Where's the data? Show me measurements, and what those measurements are based on.

> *Where is all that new crust going to go Georgie old boy? It sure as hell*
> *isn't going into the northern hemisphere, ... because, you guessed it! ... the*
> *Arctic is rifting open as well!*

Is it any wonder that the average height of Antarctica is higher than the other continents? Have you ever thought of this – that convergent plate boundaries are typically in equatorial and temperate regions, while rifting occurs at both poles. Interestingly, the north pole is an oceanic basin that has frequent rift-type earthquakes while the south pole is two miles high and has virtually no earthquakes (except at a few locations along the coast). Antarctica is an important, but poorly understood piece in the global tectonics puzzle. It is widely accepted that active deformation is ongoing in western Marie Byrd Land and the Ross Embayment. These are both part of the West Antarctic Rift System, but rates and causes of the deformation are unknown. Two possible causes of the deformation observed in this region include tectonic extension in the Ross Embayment as West and East Antarctica separate and crustal uplift caused by isostatic rebound following the last glacial maximum. Having said that, I'll admit that I don't know any more about the geology of that ice-covered land than anyone else if you'll admit that there is not enough information available for you to make any wild earth expansion claims based on the sparse data that exists for Antarctica.

> *Plate Tectonics? phft!*

>

> *The utter brainlessness of plate tectonics and its "George" types is beyond*

> *the pale.*

Earth Expansion. Ego expansion. Nothing more.